DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 701 EA 006 539

AUTHOR Wilson, Alfred P.; Smith, Vivian E.
TITLE The Public School Principal's Function in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership as Defined by an Analysis of Books Contained in the 1973 Edition of "Books in Print". No. 74107.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Center for Extended Services.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 16p.; Related documents are EA 006 533-540
AVAILABLE FROM Alfred P. Wilson, Holton Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506 ($0.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Administration; Elementary Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; High Schools; *Instruction; Instructional Improvement; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; *Principals

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the content of books listed in the 1973 "Books in Print" that deal with the school principalship. A content analysis research method is used to determine the principal's functions in curriculum and instructional leadership and to indicate similar and unique functions at various schools levels. Principal behavior is classified according to cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. Frequency tables present the data. The study reveals 46 separate functions in curriculum and instructional leadership. (DW)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CENTER FOR EXTENDED SERVICES

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

KSU

EA 006 539

The Public School Principal's Function in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership As Defined By An Analysis of Books Contained in the 1973 Edition of Books in Print[1]

Alfred P. WIlson — Kansas State University

Vivian E. Smith — Greenfield Park, Quebec, Canada

[1]This is one of a series of papers on the principals' function as derived from authors of books and periodical articles. Additional studies of the principalship are available by writing the authors at Holton Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506.

$0.50

74101

Since 1916 when the Department of Secondary School Principals was organized [1] (The Department of Elementary School Principals was established in 1920[2]), various concepts have been formulated concerning the expected performance of school principals. The divergent expectations of the principal have been reported by, among others, Horowitz, et. al.[3], Sergiovanni and Carver[4], Chase[5], and Miklos[6]. Goldhammer[7] seems to summarize the results when he states that the position of the principal is uncertain and ambiguous.

---

[1] Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973), p. 19.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

[3] Myer Horowitz, Gary J. Anderson, and Dorothy N. Richardson, "Divergent Views of the Principal's Role: Expectations Held by Principals, Teachers and Superintendents," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XV (December, 1969), p. 195.

[4] Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1973), pp. 175-176.

[5] F.S. Chase, "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook, 1 (July, 1953), 2-3.

[6] E. Miklos, "Dimension of Conflicting Expectations and the Leader Behavior of Principals" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Alberta, 1963), p. 7.

[7] Keith Goldhammer and Gerald L. Becker, "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, Volume 6, No. 3 (April, 1970), p. 11.

The Problem

While and analysis of more than 50 studies on the principalship reported in Dissertation Abstracts reveals divergent conceptions of the principal's role, no thorough single analysis was found concerning how the principal functions. In addition, there was no evidence in the research indicating whether or not the functions are similar for elementary, middle school, junior and senior high school principals. The need for such analysis is urgently required at a time when educators are reorganizing the school systems and universities are redeveloping their training programs.

Purposes and Objectives

It was the purpose of the study to determine what differences, if any, existed in the function of the public school principalships in curriculum and instructional leadership, as derived from books on the principalship listed in the 1973 edition of Books in Print.

The objectives of the study were:

1. To make a content analysis of the elementary, middle, junior and senior high school principals' function in curriculum and instructional leadership as delineated by the book authors.

2. To indicate the functions in curriculum and instructional leadership that were similar for each of the above mentioned levels of administration.

---

[8]Stephen P. Hencley, Lloyd E. McCleary, and J.H. McGrath, The Elementary School Principalship (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1970), p.6.

3. To indicate what function in curriculum and instructional leadership were unique to a particular level of administration, i.e., elementary, middle, junior and senior high school.

Method of Study

Content analysis was the research method used in this study. The content variables or categories used were selected from works by Ocker[9], Melton[10], and Snyder[11] with selected categories being added. In addition, each time a behavior was classified under one of the categories it was also considered in a two-dimensional way. First, the behavior was classified as pertaining to elementary, middle, junior or high school. When no particular school level was indicated for a given behavior, the variable was coded under

---

[9]Sharon Dale Ocker, "An Analysis of Trends in Educational Administration," unpublished Ed. D. dissertaion, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1967.

[10]Joseph Melton, "Perceptions of the Ideal and Actual Role of the Elementary School Principalship," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1958.

[11]Willard S. Snyder, "Elementary School Principal's Perceptions of his Ideal and Actual Role," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, United States International University, California Western Division, California, 1968.

the classification "Not Determined". Second, the behavior was classified as pertaining to the Cognitive, Affective or Psychomotor Domains.

No effot was made to tally the frequency with which particular categories of content occurred in a given book after the initial recording had been made unless the category referred to a different level in the cognitive or affective domain of schooling. The cognitive levels are those defined by Bloom, et. al. [12] The affective levels and definitions are those used by Krathwohl, et. al. [13] The psychomotor domain is that defined by Harrow[14].

---

[12]Benjamin S. Bloom, et. al., eds,, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 15.

[13]Anita J. Harrow, A Taxonomy of the Psychomotor Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972.

[14]David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Mosia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964), p. 6.

Analysis

The manner in which the tallies were distributed and assigned to the levels of schooling and the three analytical domains in shown in Table 1. This table shows that a total of 46 variables were coded for the principal's function in curriculum and instructional leadership. No variables were coded for either the middle school or junior high school levels, 23 variables (50 percent) were coded for the elementary school level, 11 (23.9 percent) for the high school level, and 12 (26.1 percent) for the "not determined" level.

Besides classifying each of the 46 variables according to level of schooling, each one was also classified as denoting a behavior in the cognitive, affective, or psychomotor domains. Table 1 reveals that 23 of the variables indicated behavior which was affective in nature, 23 indicated behavior which was cognitive in nature, and none of the variables indicated behavior which was psychomotor in nature.

Table 1 shows how the variables which were classified as representing cognitive of affective behavior were assigned to the various levels of their respective domains. It also reveals that the variables assigned to each level of a domain were converted into a percentage of the total number of variables assigned to that particular domain.

Table 1. An Analysis of Selected Textbooks Denoting the Principal's Function in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership.

Level	Total No. Tallies	Percentage Total Tallies
Elementary School	23	50.0
Middle School	0	0.0
Junior High School	0	0.0
Not Determined	11	23.9
Not Determined	12	26.1
Total	46	100.0
	Cognitive Domain	
Level 1 (Knowledge)	4	17.3
Level 2 (Comprehension)	3	13.1
Level 3 (Application)	0	0.0
Level 4 (Analysis)	0	0.0
Level 5 (Synthesis)	13	56.5
Level 6 (Evaluation)	3	13.1
Total	23	100.0
	Affective Domain	
Level 1 (Receiving)	1	4.3
Level 2 (Responding)	14	60.9
Level 3 (Valuing)	8	34.8
Level 4 (Organization)	0	0.0
Level 5 (Characterization)	0	0.0
	23	100.0
	Psychomotor Domain	
Total	0	0.0

The 23 variables assigned to the cognitive domain were classified among its six levels thus: four (17.3 percent) of them were classified in level 1 (knowledge); three (13.1 percent) in level 2 (comprehension); zero in level 3 (application) and also in level 4 (analysis); thirteen (56.5 percent) in level 5 (synthesis); and three (13.1 percent) in level 6 (evaluation).

An equal number of variables were assigned to the affective domain. However, the distribution of the variables among the five levels of the affective domain was different. Whereas in the case of the cognitive domain the variables were classified in level 5 (synthesis) and level 6 (evaluation), no variables were classified in the highest levels of the affective domain--level 4 (organization) and level 5 (characterization).

The 23 variables assigned to the affective domain were classified among the five levels as follows: One (4.3 percent) of them was classified in level 1 (receiving); fourteen (60.9 percent) in level 2 (responding); eight (34.8 percent) in level 3 (valuing); and zero in level 4 (organization) and level 5 (characterization).

Table 2 shows how the 46 variables which were assigned to the principal's function in curriculum and instructional leadership were distributed among the various levels of schooling. A study of Table 2 show that the variables were concentrated in category 1-1 (organizing for curriculum development) and to a lesser extent in category 1-2 (staff involvement in curriculum development) and 1-8

Table 2. Book Analysis of the Principal's Function in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Assigned by Subcategories to Levels of Schooling.

	Subcategory	Level of Schooling				
		Elementary	Middle School	Junior High	High School	Not Determined
1-1	Organizing for curriculum development	4			2	2
1-2	Staff involvement in curriculum development	3			2	1
1-3	Community involvement in curriculum development	2			1	
1-5	Planning school plant for the curriculum					1
1-7	Orientation of new teachers	3				
1-8	In-service education	2			1	2
1-9	Planning for selection of curriculum materials					1
1-10	Planning for use of curriculum materials					1
1-11	Selecting learning resource techniques	1				
1-14	Developing articulation between area high schools				1	
1-16	Working with curriculum consultants	1				1
1-18a	School philosophy and objectives	1			1	
1-19	Citizenship training	1				
1-20	Handling controversial issues in curriculum	1				
1-27	Planning team teaching program	1				1

	Subcategory	Level of Schooling				
		Elementary	Middle School	Junior High	High School	Not Determined
1-28	Implementing library program	1			1	1
1-29	Acting as a resource person	2			1	1
1-30	Miscellaneous				1	
	Total	23	0	0	11	12

(in-service education).

A total of eight variables were tallied in category 1-1 (organizing for curriculum development), four of which were assigned to the elementary school level, zero to the middle school and junior high school levels, two to the high school level, and two to the "not determined" level. The authors of the analyzed books wrote more concerning the elementary principal's function in curriculum and instructional leadership than they did about the high school principal's function in this area. None of the authors wrote about either the middle school or junior high school principal's function in curriculum and instructional leadership.

Six variables were tallied for category 1-2 (staff involvement in curriculum development). Of these, three were assigned to the elementary school level, two to the high school level, and one to the "not determined" level.

Three variables were tallied for category 1-3 (community involvement in curriculum development), two of which were assigned to the elementary school level and one to the high school level.

Only one variable was tallied for category 1-5 (planning school plant for the curriculum). The writer stated that the principal has as major responsibility in defining the characteristics of the learning environment and that he must know about the influence of the environment on the instructional process.

The three variables which were tallied for category 1-7 (orientation of new teachers to the curriculum) were all assigned to the elementary school level. No author discussed the function of the middle

school, junior high school, or high school principal in this important administrative concern.

In-service education (category 1-8) was discussed by several authors. Of the five variables tallied for this category, two were assigned to the elementary school level, one to the high school level, and two to the "not determined" level.

One variable was tallied for category 1-9 (planning for the selection of curriculum materials) and one for category 1-10 (planning for the use of curriculum materials). In each case the variable was assigned to the "not determined" level. One author stressed that the principal should be committed to assuring that all the staff members participate in the selection of curriculum materials. Another author emphasized that the principal should carefully plan for the use of all curriculum materials which were being purchased for the use of the teachers.

The principal's function in selecting learning resource techniques was explored in category 1-11. The author stated that elementary school principals should carefully consider what learning resource techniques maximize opportunities for transter of learning to take place.

One author wrote about the importance of the high school principals developing articulation between their schools (category 1-14). Nothing was written concerning the function of the elementary, middle school, or junior high school principal relative to this task.

There were two variables tallied for category 1-16 (working with curriculum consultants), one of which was assigned to the elementary

school level and the other to the "not determined" level. One writer stated that the elementary school principal should know how to plan with the consultant in order to develop a more flexible curriculum. The other author state that the principal should be aware of the importance of working harmoniously with the curriculum consultant.

Two variables were also tallied for category 1-18a (school philosophy and objectives), one of which was assigned to the elementary school level and the other one to the high school level. The gist of both variables was that the elementary school and high school principal must provide opportunities for continuous clarification and redefinition of the school's philosophy and objectives.

One variable each was tallied in the following two categories both of which were assigned to the elementay level: category 1-19 (citizenship training) and category 1-20 (handling controversial issues in the curriculum dealt with the elementary principal's responsibility for initiating a study of sex education problems in his school. Nothing was written about the function of the middle school principal. junior high or high school principals in this area

Two variables were tallied in category 1-26 (planning team teaching programs) of which one was assigned to the elementary school level and the other to the "not determined" level. In speaking about the elementary principal's function in planning team teaching programs, the author stated that the principal's function must start with the planning and organizing of the team structure before proceeding to the selection of teachers and helping the team state and define basic goals.

Considerable attention was devoted by the authors to the principal's function in implementing a library program (category 1-27) and in acting as a resource person (category 1-28). Three variables were tallied for the principal's function in implementing a library program, one of which was assigned to the elementary school level, one to the high school level, and one to the "not determined" level.

Nothing was written by the authors of the analyzed books dealing with the principal's function relative to thirteen of the categories. This void in the literature is surprising, especially in several areas. Specifically, nothing was written about the principal's function in adapting the school plant for the curriculum (category 1-6), in developing articulation between local elementary schools (category 1-13). developing articulation between elementary and secondary schools (category 1-12), curriculum supervision (category 1-15), or evaluating curriculum consultant's services (category 1-17). Neither was anything written in the analyzed books about the principal's function in the following areas of administrative concern: financing curriculum development (category 1-4); evaluating the content and organization, timing and schedule of the school curriculum (category 1-18b); academic freedom (category 1-21); types of curricula (category 1-22); evaluating resource materials in the curriculum (category 1-23); vocational education (category 1-24); and college preparatory program (category 1-25).